

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-8 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 5 being the independent claims. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 to avoid any ambiguity in these claims regarding the term "connection." Claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively, have also been amended to incorporate these changes. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims have *not* been amended to overcome the cited art nor have they been narrowed with respect to the original claims. The entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,411,986 to Susai *et al.* (*hereinafter* "Susai"). Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but respectfully traverse this rejection.

The claimed apparatus and method are directed to a system for network client-server multiplexing. Independent claim 1, as aesthetically amended, recites an apparatus comprising a "means for allowing said second client to access information on said server via said second connection *without waiting for said first client to disconnect.*" (Emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 5 as aesthetically amended recites a method comprising a step of "allowing said second client to access information on said server via said second connection *without waiting for said first client to disconnect.*" (Emphasis added).

Although Susai discloses a method and device for network client-server multiplexing, Susai fails to teach or suggest allowing a second client to access information on a server without waiting for the first client to disconnect. Applicants note that the Examiner refers to portions of Susai's disclosure that discuss maintaining the interface unit/server connection for a second client's use after closing the connection between the first client and the interface unit. (*See* Office Action at ¶ 6). However, Susai teaches closing the connection between a first client and an interface unit before allowing a second client access as can be observed by the bidirectional layout of flow 514 in Fig. 5 of Susai. (*See* Susai, col. 6, ll. 5-12).

For the foregoing reasons, Susai does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1 or 5, and thus, it cannot anticipate those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Furthermore, since claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively, these claims are also not anticipated by Susai in view of these arguments and further in view of their own recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 6/14/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600